

The Sun.

SATURDAY, APRIL 10, 1909.

Entered at the Post Office at New York as Second Class Mail Matter.

Subscriptions by Mail, Postpaid.

DAILY, Per Month	\$0 50
DAILY, Per Year	5 00
SUNDAY, Per Year	2 00
DAILY AND SUNDAY, Per Year	6 00
DAILY AND SUNDAY, Per Month	70

1 postage to foreign countries added.

All checks, money orders, &c., to be made payable to THE SUN.

Published by the Sun Printing and Publishing Association at 170 Nassau street, in the Borough of Manhattan, New York. President and Treasurer of the Association, William M. Laffan, 170 Nassau street; Secretary of the Association, Franklin Bartlett, 3 Nassau street.

London office, 25 Abchurch Lane, 1 Arundel street, Strand. The daily and Sunday Sun are on sale in London at the American and Colonial Exchange, Carlton street, Second street, and the Daily and Sunday Sun, 17 Green street, Leicester Square.

Paris office, 32 Rue Louis le Grand. The daily and Sunday editions are on sale at Kiosque 12, near the Grand Hotel; Kiosque 17, Boulevard des Capucines, corner Place de l'Opera, and Kiosque 19, Boulevard des Italiens, corner Rue Louis le Grand.

If our friends who favor us with manuscripts for publication wish to have their names printed thereon, they must in all cases send stamps for that purpose.

A Hope Fulfilled.

In a period of particularly noisy and self-assertive political fraud and misrepresentation ETHAN ALLEN HITCHCOCK held the office of Secretary of the Interior. Incapable of false pretence, he performed his duties with singleness of purpose and undivided allegiance to duty. Hence it became inevitable, under the conditions that existed, that he should fall into disfavour and finally be sacrificed to the exigencies of political ambition and the necessities of personal unscrupulousness.

Had Mr. HITCHCOCK been of a different habit of mind his dismissal from the Department of the Interior would have aroused him to revelations shocking to the public.

One of the last hopes expressed by this admirable and amiable citizen was that the good nature and consideration of his friends might prevent a situation that should force upon him the supremely distasteful duty of revealing the untruthfulness and perfidy of a man who was then the President of the United States. To-day it is pleasant to know that this hope was fulfilled.

The National Budget.

Mr. CORTELYOU's article on the regulation of the national budget in the *North American Review* for April presents a warning rather than a specific remedy. Declaring that "between the receipts and disbursements of the Government there is a growing difference in the wrong direction," he says that "this condition seems to demand not only some effective plan for increasing the revenues but a thorough system of coordination whereby receipts and disbursements may be properly compared and adjusted, one to the other, by an established authority which shall be responsible for the final balance."

Under the present system of government the legislative branch has "power to lay and collect taxes, duties, imports and excises, to pay the debts and provide for the common defence and general welfare of the United States." In other words, the Congress is the constitutionally established authority responsible for receipts and disbursements. Does not Mr. CORTELYOU's proposition suggest some authority, superior to the Congress, having power to scrutinize and revise the acts of that body? It is true that the President might, if he feared a deficit in the Treasury or an undue excess of appropriations over probable revenue, veto any or even all of the appropriation bills as they came to him. He would doubtless have authority to do this, but proper justification would surely be lacking. He could not hold up all appropriation bills until the last of the series reached his hands, and until the total of all was known the matter of excessive appropriation could not be determined. Under the present system Congress itself seems almost equally unable to control totals. All might be well up to the end of a session, when a huge river and harbor bill or an extravagant sundry civil bill, or both, might be passed under the irresistible pressure of public clamor. Such an experience is at least conceivable.

There are obvious difficulties in any plan for an authority with legislative power greater than that of the Congress. Such power would be implied in the creation of any body authorized to reduce or to increase the appropriations made by Congress. The creation of such an authority would require the amendment of Article I, section 8, of the Constitution by a proviso to the effect that in the event of appropriations in excess of revenues this authority, whatever it might be, should have power to reduce the appropriations or increase the taxes. Under such a system legislation by the Congress would be of no value. Senators and Representatives might discuss, might present what they regarded as the needs and the demands of their constituents, but if power of regulation were vested in some other authority, that authority might better be entrusted with all power of the matter of financial legislation.

That our method is utterly wrong there can be no question. There is a total absence of "team play." One committee handles one bill and another committee handles another bill, and each measure is considered in independence of all others. There is a theory of the treatment of each with regard to all the rest, but the theory is vague and has only limited effect on final results. At the beginning of a session the various branches of the service submit their estimates of their needs for the coming fiscal year. These form a general basis for legislation, which to some extent they influence. Thus during the last session the District of Columbia estimated its needs at \$19,175,352. The

House appropriated \$9,555,049.52. The Senate increased the appropriation to \$12,089,872.16, and the difference was adjusted in conference by a final appropriation of \$10,679,145.49. The estimate for fortifications was over \$17,000,000, and the final appropriation a little over \$8,000,000. The navy called for \$134,393,447.99 and got \$135,935,199.05. Then there are deficiency bills and urgent deficiency bills, and the scramble in Congress for public buildings and river and harbor work.

We offer no solution for this complex and difficult problem, perhaps the most complex and difficult of all the problems before the country. Its proper determination demands all the wisdom that can be packed into the only body authorized under our present system to act upon it. Under that system there appears no way by which the Executive can control and regulate. The reference of all appropriation bills to one committee in each house, that committee being nominally authorized to fix a limit on each bill, a limit which could not be exceeded by either the House or the Senate, would create in both branches at every session a roaring and raving band of insurgents with a platform declaring that no created body should or could be greater than its creator. The establishment of a special department of receipts and disbursements with full power of collection and distribution would be to subvert an essential principle of our institutions. The people look to their elected representatives for pensions, for public buildings, for public works, for employment for themselves and their sons and daughters, for free seeds and numerous other individual and commercial blessings regarded as the legitimate and necessary fruits of a free government.

At the root of the whole matter there lies the controlling force, the people. If the people want an economical government, an administration with expenditures kept down to the level of receipts, it rests with them to modify their individual and commercial activities and demands for appropriations and to hold their representatives individually responsible for a limitation of the draft on the pockets of the taxpayers, with defeat at the next election as the penalty for extravagance.

A Classical Reminiscence.

Sometimes we almost sympathize with the Hon. SERENO ELLIS PAYNE, baited and damned so cordially for a tariff bill which was made for him and is now being made over.

Remembering what emotion and fire have been spent upon this resultant of a thousand grabs, thinking of those wise and quiet gentlemen of the Senate who are at work and have been at work on a tariff bill, we are reminded, perhaps by the mighty magic of protection itself, that grammar for plucking folks without their knowing it, of a little incident in *Iololos* and the Latin reader. *MEDEA* boiled a ram in a caldron and it came out a tender lamb, as innocent, helpless and pitifully bleating as that modern fiction "the ultimate customer."

Will the Hon. SERENO ELLIS PAYNE know the House tariff bill when the Senate gets through with it?

Dictation.

"The people," said Governor HUGHES at Rochester, "are going to stop the present way of dictating nominations."

Going to stop the present way of dictating nominations, and take up his way of dictating nominations by means of State committees.

If Governor HUGHES succeeds in forcing his notion upon this State he will gain another personal victory, and the legend or history of his sanctity and invulnerability will have another impressive chapter; but what will the voters of New York gain? Is government by a political committee "representative government?"

No doubt we speak as the wicked, but, dictation for dictation, we prefer the present system, for which we owe Governor HUGHES.

The Battleship Mississippi.

Our esteemed New Orleans contemporaries maintain their agitation in the matter of the battleship Mississippi, which is about to receive a silver service from the State after which she has been named. They want the ship to enter the big river and proceed to Natchez for the purpose, and all sorts of delegations and representative bodies have been asked to contribute to the general uproar in favor of that place. The Department has chosen Horn Island, lying about ten miles off Biloxi in the Gulf of Mexico, for reasons satisfactory to the responsible officials, but the New Orleans newspapers and their well drilled chorus are in full voice for the other place, and overwhelming are the dust and the vociferation thereof.

The animating motive of New Orleans is not difficult to identify. To be sure the silver service presentation itself is no business of that particular community; but indirectly the presence of a big battleship there, ever although in passing, is of immense importance to them, for it will illustrate the capacity of the river's mouth, which by the way nobody doubts, and tend to confirm their claims to easy entrance and exit for big ships—a proposition which has not been challenged in well informed quarters. It is not the fault of the Navy Department that New Orleans is in a hysterical state of mind over this emergency in buckram, but the paroxysms continue nevertheless. One would infer after a careful analysis of the vociferation that the Department in ordering the battleship to Horn Island to receive the silver service had struck a dastard blow at the very vitals of New Orleans and discredited all its claims to commercial importance and utility. As a matter of fact the Department had not New Orleans in view and was not considering the capacity of the river at all.

The Mississippi River from the Passes up to Natchez and beyond is capable of accommodating the biggest ships in the whole world. It has a channel depth of from forty to a hundred feet at almost all stages. Once across the bar at the

mouth—and there is little if any doubt as to that—the battleship could steam up to Natchez without the slightest difficulty especially at this time of the year, when the river is bank full and at its highest capacity. The trip of the Mississippi would also illustrate all of New Orleans's claims and perhaps leave a great many easy dollars in that town. Moreover, there would be a junket and various outpourings and innumerable opportunities for eloquence and wassail. The Progressive Union would get out its brass bands and its orators. Flags would fly from the Picayune Tier, canons would thunder at Canal street, Baton Rouge would decorate and Bayou Sara throw a fit in ribbons. The carnival would be called back. The whole riverside for 300 miles would break out in ecstatic gooseflesh.

But afterward—and that is what the Navy Department seems to be thinking about—would come the question of getting the big ship back to deep water. The Mississippi would have to be turned around. The records of the civil war show that our ships used to go around between Baton Rouge and Natchez—and the biggest of them were no more than 250 feet long and drew less than seventeen feet of water. What might not happen to the Mississippi, 500 feet long and drawing between twenty-eight and thirty feet? The river is high now, the current is four or five miles an hour. Who can estimate the difficulties and perils of turning around so vast a vessel, after the shouting of the multitudes, and recovering her to safety?

The trouble is that New Orleans and the civilian claqueurs are thinking of the hurrah and the festivities, while the Department is consulting the serious problems of the case. Horn Island is safe. The Mississippi could be sent to Natchez, possibly to Memphis, in times of war with incalculable interests at stake, but why send her up that river now to make a politicians' holiday?

The Most Heroic Democrat.

The Hon. AUGUSTUS O. STANLEY of the Second Kentucky district disregarding the petition of a constituent to vote for a tax on barytes, and exclaiming passionately, "By the Eternal God, I shall vote for free barytes" (thunder of applause) makes a fine figure in the limelight; but for unsophisticated heroism and careless independence commend us to the Hon. CHARLES A. KORBLY, the new member from the Seventh Indiana (Indianapolis) district, who supplanted that battle scarred veteran JESSE OVERSTREET.

To a manufacturer of saws who wrote to Mr. KORBLY to say that the reduction of the duty on saws in the Payne bill would wipe out his margin of profit the new Representative replied that he was not a protectionist "in any sense of the word," and that he stood for a tariff for revenue only. As to the saw business:

"If you say you cannot turn out as many saws in a given time as a foreign maker can turn out in the same period of time, or if you have to give a larger percentage of your output to your wage earners than the other fellow has to give to his wage earners, is that a sufficient reason why I should be deprived of the right of exchanging the products of my labor for the other fellow's saws when the other fellow gives me the saw for a less amount of my product than you are able or willing to take for your saw?"

We have said that Mr. KORBLY is a more heroic figure than Mr. STANLEY of Kentucky, and the proof is that the new man from Indiana, who argues the tariff question like the late FRANK FURD, turned the Hon. JESSE OVERSTREET out of a district which he had represented for seven terms by 683 votes in a total of 68,680, while the Kentuckian who scorned majestically to consider a duty on barytes had a plurality of 4,018 in his district. To do the new member from Indiana justice he seems to believe what he professes, but we can imagine the chuckle of satisfaction with which the bereaved OVERSTREET read the ultimatum to the Indianapolis saw maker.

Respectfully but firmly we decline to believe the despatch sent from Asheville, N. C., which attributes to Mr. PACK the cruelty of naming a set of triplets WILLIAM, JENNINGS and BRYAN. North Carolina is a notorious fount of mythology. The anecdote is merely a clumsy way of reminding the Nebraska Jefferson that three nominations are enough and too many. Besides, "Bryan Pack" is distinctly and intentionally contemptuous.

The Quito Exposition.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN:—Sir, in your article on the Quito exposition you say "probably few visitors from this country will pass the entrance gates of the exposition." This is true, for Quito is hard to reach, being on the western side of South America, which means several changes in transportation facilities. However, as you say, "the morning light on the towering peak of Chimborazo will repay the traveler for his discomfort." A friend recently asked me the question: "What is the view from the mountains from the coast to the capital, and he says that the view is beyond description."

The writer desires to visit the exposition—and he is not the only one. The men have merged. The Government's ingenious talk about "proper partnership" and "the right kind of leadership" is this mere passing phrase. It does at the beginning of the address, and the audience sits politely through it, but it is when he turns to the flaying of the "foul boss," "petty scamp" and "the special interest" that active applause begins.

"It was only when he hit us that the people cheered," said a useful boss commenting upon the Governor's speech in Buffalo. "What he said about construction was listened to, but when he got to destruction even the women yelled."

Here perhaps it is time to stop for the moment in any review of the State situation. It is clear that there is to be a campaign. It is clear just what kind of campaign is to be expected and is expected by both sides. The hope of Hughes and the expectation of his friends lie in his ability to rouse the masses of the voters; but the masses of the voters are to be roused by the manhandling of somebody—and here the boss comes in. As for the merit of the direct nominations measure, that is above all in the fact that it supplies an additional excuse for an additional licking. The Governor says it is a "bill to abolish the bosses." Here is the moral issue. Friends of the Governor say that the moral issue will be illuminated by the Governor's attack upon the bosses. Looked at dispassionately, it is hard to escape the notion that a moral issue is to be made effective by the invoking of the Lynch law.

DIRECT NOMINATIONS.

BUFFALO, April 9.—Two comments, one friendly, one unfriendly, but both documents in character after all, may serve to reveal much of the situation as to the direct nominations measure, so called, here as elsewhere in New York State:

If Governor Hughes will adopt Mr. Hearst's methods in making his direct nominations, he will be the part of a fool to attempt to force upon the results by proxy.

This is one comment; the second, the expression of opinion of an ardent "friend of the Governor," was as follows:

"The people will never read Governor Hughes's bill. They haven't read it now. Why should they? The Governor tells them that it is 'a bill to abolish the bosses.' The bosses were against it. Just as soon as the Governor begins to campaign the State the unpopularity of the bosses and the popularity of Hughes will do the rest."

It is not difficult to see upon analysis that both comments cited above mean about the same thing. They mean that the opponents of the so-called direct nominations bill and the champions thereof look outside the merits of the measure, look to an appeal to elemental passion as the force that must win and lose the coming fight. "A bill to abolish the bosses," the title is half the fight; add to the title the *ipse dixit* of the Governor, emphasized by abuse of the bosses—this is what both sides expect.

In Albany, where the Governor's programme is known or where his friends pretend to know it, its supporters say frankly:

"The people in this State are not yet aroused. No, they know very little about the measure. They know the Governor and they know the bosses. Just wait till Governor Hughes gets loose at the county fairs, the district schools, yes, even the churches, then the people will rise as they rose before in the race-track fight."

Now, this is the Albany pronouncement—believe it or not—and it has a value in the estimate of the situation. It is indisputably correct so far as it assumes that John Smith of Buffalo—or Mike Slovinsky for that matter, and rationally there is more of him—has not read the bill and never will read the bill. Slovinsky is not going to be enlightened that way. This is the judgment of the friend of the Governor who says that it is the man and not the measure that is to arouse the people. Obviously this is a little outside the merits of the bill. The result is to flow from the successful raising of a riot rather than an appeal to reason. If virtue is confirmed in the pending question you may have it on the authority of the friends of the Governor that virtue is to be of the strong arm variety.

In Buffalo as in New York reasonable men, that is, men appearing to have reason, differ as to the merits of the Governor's bill; but when one of them ventures to put his objections in terms because he is apt to have read a part of the bill, when he specifies a section of the measure that seems to him likely to work badly, up rises a friend of the Governor and says:

"That is a mere detail. The principle of the bill rises above and beyond all details, and the details are nothing."

What is this principle that is always on the lips of the defenders of the Governor's measure? The friends of the Governor say, "It abolishes the bosses." Ask for proof—you have it in the answer: "The bosses," against it.

After all, this is something approximating a formula. The people are with Hughes, the people are against the bosses, the people will go anywhere Hughes takes them to fight the bosses. Hence the Governor's bill must pass. The fact that the bosses have beaten it this year is the best evidence that it will pass next year, because the action of the bosses in beating it gives the Governor just the ammunition he wanted. Back of the formula there will be some latent suggestion about "the spirit of the age."

"The example of the West" and other phrases of the muckraking magazines ad infinitum and ad nauseam. Reinforce this by an appeal to the history of recent legislative issues in which the Governor and his fellow partisans were defeated, and the field of force of the friend of the Governor is fairly covered.

Now, to get down to current opinion as one meets it, the plain fact is that the area of interest in the Governor's measure at the moment is manifestly circumscribed. There are very few people interested in the measure at present, and among the people interested there is considerable difference of opinion. Yet both sides of the argument agree that it is not now possible to tell what may be the outcome of a campaign of agitation, abuse and appeal to the people. Governor Hughes may not be wholly gratified to know that he is regarded as a second La Follette or a brand new Cummins, but it is from the triumphs of these men that his agitation gains its momentum on both sides.

The question at the present moment is the mere who think most highly of the bill do not waste their time or yours telling you that the naked merits of the proposition will seduce the popular mind and generate the energy necessary to pass it—not in Buffalo—not in Albany—not in New York; it is the boss issue that is to pass the bill, that is, the boss issue with Hughes to do the talking about: "And who can talk like Hughes?"

It is the beginning of the campaign, of course. There is no mistaking this fact. The action of the Legislature in Albany in defeating the bill is well outside the question, but it is the beginning of a Hearst campaign—not a Hughes campaign, unless the method of the men have merged. The Governor's ingenious talk about "proper partnership" and "the right kind of leadership" is this mere passing phrase. It does at the beginning of the address, and the audience sits politely through it, but it is when he turns to the flaying of the "foul boss," "petty scamp" and "the special interest" that active applause begins.

"It was only when he hit us that the people cheered," said a useful boss commenting upon the Governor's speech in Buffalo. "What he said about construction was listened to, but when he got to destruction even the women yelled."

Romance and Reality.

Knicker—He called her the light of his life. Bocker—Now he wants the gas rebate.

THE CHESTER AMERICAN BUILT.

Her Turbines Not English, Nor Any of the Material Used in Her.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN:—Sir: Representing the company which built the Chester, I ask you to publish two facts concerning this vessel in refutation of incorrect statements that have often appeared in the newspapers.

Details of the very instructive comparative tests of the two screws now under way are of the greatest interest to many engineers, and it seems proper that as the press is the only means of giving the comparative data to the reading public, the case should be stated with absolute correctness. It should be well known that the three vessels are alike in all essential particulars, except in their motive power, the Birmingham having reciprocating engines, the Salem Curtis turbines and the Chester Parsons turbines; that they are tried at the same displacements and take air from the same source; that they steam in company, thereby encountering identical conditions of wind and sea, and that the data are taken by a board of officers whose professional standing and fairness are beyond question.

One important statement made is that the Curtis turbine is reversible and the Parsons is not. Neither turbine is reversible in the sense that mechanical alteration of position of any of its parts causes motion in the opposite direction, any more than a monkey wrench is reversible. Just as a monkey wrench is reversible by changing direction of the effort applied to it, both turbines are reversible by causing the steam which gives them rotation to flow in the opposite direction. In both turbines rows of bucketing blades or buckets are fixed to the end of the turbine opposite from the so-called blades or buckets, and piping is provided whereby steam can be admitted to or shut off from either end of the turbine at will. In both turbines to reverse steam is shut off from the so-called blades and admitted to the backing end, the same exhaust pipe serving for both conditions. In both turbines the backing blades run idly in going ahead and the so-called blades run idly in backing. In both turbines reversing is accomplished by the same mechanical means. One is as reversible as the other, as much so and no more.

The other statement often made to which we emphatically object is that the Chester's turbines are of English make. It is a statement entirely untrue. The composition is American material, worked from the mines and forests to the ship-builder's raw material by Americans. Every moment of labor spent in the building of the ship was by American mechanics. In an American shipyard designed by Americans and owned by an American citizen whose forebears for seven generations were American citizens. Even the drawings from which they were built were made on American paper by American draughtsmen, with American ink and pencils.

It is stated that the Parsons turbine was invented and brought to successful issue by the brilliant mind and patient perseverance of a distinguished Englishman, the Hon. Charles A. Parsons, who should receive rank with the great American and Fulton as a great investigator in new and untried fields. If you insist, however, that this fact makes the Chester's turbines English, you must admit that all of the local motives built of American material by American mechanics in the shipyard of the American Locomotive Company at English, for Stephenson, the inventor of the locomotive, was an Englishman; and that all steam engines of any description built in America of American material are English because, *Voilà!*, invented, designed, built and all steel ships built in this country are English because the first steel ships were designed and built in England—and in fact that all steel made in this country is English because the first steel was made in England.

Builders of the Chester were content to let her speak for herself as the product of American labor, and earnestly protest against any statement that she is not American throughout.

JOHN S. HYDE,
President, Bath Iron Works, Limited.
BATH, ME., April 8.

STOVER.

He Is Identified and His Mighty Monument Is Found.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN:—Sir: "One Who Wants to Know" should be enlightened on one very important inquiry in his line of verse in to-day's Sun: "And who is this man Stover?" Why, Stover is the man who is quoted in a recent issue of a New York newspaper as saying: "I am interested in playground work and don't trust public schools." Stover is a man who is connected largely by a semi-official connection with New York city playgrounds during William R. Willcox's park administration, when Stover was the unofficial but advisory and supervising purchasing agent and bought golf sticks and other golf playground implements, which have been preserved in the stock room of the Arsenal, in Central Park, by each successive administration as a "terrible example" of the "experienced" theorist in playground work. These implements, I am told, are kept at the Arsenal for exhibition to the large number of people from other cities seeking information in connection with playground work, and are labelled "Things you don't need."

Verbal Stover's opposition to the Academy of Physical Education and the fact that the present building is removed these monuments of ignorance and incompetency will be unearthed; but never fear, everybody knows the skeletons are there, and if the Academy of Physical Education comes to Central Park these implements can be hatched and made into a suitable stucco panel with proper inscription: "To the memory of a man experienced in playground work. His fame must not perish."

"If you who said 'Know' should ask Mr. Willcox what Stover means by saying 'I don't trust public officials.'"

ONE WHO DOES KNOW.
NEW YORK, April 8.

FAME'S PROUD TEMPLE.

New and Worthy Aspirants Knock at the Brazen Doors.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN:—Sir, in Malone, N. Y., Mr. A. Beach runs a boarding house and his sign reads:

BOARDING HOUSE.
A PEACH BOARDED HERE.

Isn't he worthy of admission to your Hall of Fame?
NEW YORK, April 9.

A Fabulist at Home.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN:—Sir: Charles E. Sopp enjoys his oilium cum dig. in this urbe. And this is no fable.
PHILADELPHIA, April 9.

Appeal to a Long Silent Bard.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN:—Sir: In view of the announcement that Gink Gilly, first baritone of the Paris Grand Opera, is to be with us next Tuesday, it going to sing the part of the Hon. Hinklin Dink that the lyric tenor of the First world the Hon. Bathhouse John, has been mute too long?
BUFFALO, April 8.

The Homeless Castro.

They shoved him off at Port au Spain where he was to land. And Barranquilla cried "Kidnoid!" The neighborhood to quit. And Fort de France now coldly says "That he will have to go."

His native land desires him not: His place is filled, instead. And so he cannot find at all.

He may have been a tyrant once. A person had to live under him. Yet every man whose wife cleans house. Will sympathize with him.

McLARDROB WILSON.

BETTER BOSTON.

Civic Uplifters at Work for Righteousness and a Salary.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN:—Sir: "Boston—1913," otherwise known as the "Civic Uplift," was launched at the Boston City Club last week. The event was notable in the history of the Hub. Many "leading citizens" were present, and the atmosphere was one of earnestness and high air and civic righteousness. Since then headquarters have been opened in the high-brow section of the city, where a score of "bright young 'zionsists'" are busy preparing "uplift" literature for the benefit of the masses.

The object of the movement is to promote oratory, to encourage the manufacture and display of "streaming pennants" bearing the slogan of the cult, "Boston—1913," in red letters on a field of white, and to welcome home distinguished citizens from foreign lands. "Boston—1913" expects every man to do his duty. If he can make a speech he must rock old Faneuil Hall at least once a month and display a pennant from his dwelling. If he has not yet developed the requisite lung power he must carry a pennant in his automobile and fly another from his place of business and a third from his residence.

Behind the guns of this mighty movement is a muckraker, now the very centre of the inner ring of the world's greatest sold. He is the cause of the righteousness. He came to Boston a year ago to expose her "rotten government," but while engaged in the muckfields was stricken with the uplift fever and is now one of the most ardent and forceful workers in the cause of banners, oratory and well-cleaned homes. Of course he draws a salary, but that is always true of the man behind the guns. Mr. Edward A. Filene furnishes the sinews of war, and is therefore entitled to all praise. But these things are merely incidental. What the masses are interested in is the promise of the uplifters that in 1913 there will be pennants enough and superheated air enough in Boston to make it the "finest and most beautiful city in the world."

BOSTON, April 9. BOSTON—1900.

AMERICAN MANNERS.

Indictment of the Parents and the Young of the Land.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN:—Sir: Why is it that good manners are so absolutely lacking to-day among young people of all classes in this world? The answer is, I believe, in dealing with youth, and he finds this lack of good manners to be one of the most glaring traits of American youth. There are a few here and there who seem instinctively to know and feel what is proper in respect, but the overwhelming majority appear to be without instinct or training.

The latter is all the more surprising because the average American parent to-day seems to be so anxious that his sons should have the advantage of a college education, that he is willing to spend entirely oblivious of the importance of a good home education, of the instilling of decent manners and good morals in their children, and to be convinced that a good college education is the only thing that is essential. Perhaps the reason why so far as good manners are concerned the average collegian to-day is such a barbarian. Heaven help the boy who, not having been trained in the rudiments of good manners at home, expects to acquire them at college, and in these days the manners of football prevail!

Part of the bad manners of the American youth consists of his boastfulness and conceit. This is a national trait steadily inculcated at school and college. If it is to be corrected, it must be done by the common sense of the youth himself and by association with those of other nations who are more civilized—with the citizens of France, for example. The foundation of good manners must be laid at home, and this the American parent to-day absolutely fails to do. Our children are becoming insufferable in this respect, and nowhere more so than right here in New York.

NEW YORK, April 9. E. H. S.

Galle Persepicuity.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN:—Sir: It is an agreeable and refreshing surprise to find that French newspaper representatives have so much perspicacity.
NEW YORK, April 8. E. T. W.

Waste in the Public Lecture Course.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN:—Sir: I understand that the Department of Education is the most expensive department in the city of New York. It should be the most expensive department, but it should be in the contrivance of economizing in its expenditures. During the last few months I have attended a series of lectures given at one of the public schools in the city of New York. The results noticed that there were only twenty or thirty adults in attendance. Each of these lectures I presume cost the city of New York \$20 to \$30, which when the schools in the city of New York are taken into consideration is no small sum.

It is not my opinion that these lectures are not beneficial, but spending \$20 or \$30 a night for the benefit of twenty or thirty people I believe is the most simple form of graft.

In most of the cases the supervisor of the lectures is fully exonerated from all blame, as the report sent to him by the parties in charge of the lectures is the report of the attendance of school children and not of adults, as called for.

NEW YORK, April 8. GEORGE MULLEN.

Progress of Suffrage in England.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN:—Sir: The Women's Social and Political Union, one of the militant suffrage societies in England, has just brought out its annual report. This shows a remarkable growth in the number of its members. The union in one year has increased its office staff from thirty persons to seventy-five, and the space occupied by its London headquarters from thirteen rooms to nineteen, besides establishing branch offices in eleven other cities. Its results from the sale of literature have grown from \$3,000 in